arXiv:1605.07702v2 [math.SG] 29 Jun 2016

Automatically generating Fukaya categories and computing quantum cohomology

Sheel Ganatra

Abstract. Suppose one has found a non-empty sub-category $\mathcal{A}$ of the Fukaya category of a compact Calabi-Yau manifold X which is *homologically smooth* in the sense of non-commutative geometry, a condition intrinsic to $\mathcal{A}$. Then, we show $\mathcal{A}$ split-generates the Fukaya category. An immediate consequence of earlier work [**G1**, **GPS1**, **GPS2**] is that the open-closed and closed-open maps, relating quantum cohomology to the Hochschild invariants of the Fukaya category, are also isomorphisms. Our result continues to hold when $c_1(X) \neq 0$ (for instance, when X is monotone Fano), under a further hypothesis: the 0th Hochschild cohomology of $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A})$ should have sufficiently large rank: $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}) \geq \mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{QH}^0(X)$. Our proof depends only on formal structures of Fukaya categories and open-closed maps, the most recent and crucial of which was introduced and will be verified in joint work with Perutz and Sheridan [**GPS1**, **GPS2**] and independently by Abouzaid-Fukaya-Oh-Ohta-Ono [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$]. The homological smoothness hypothesis on $\mathcal{A}$ are satisfied for instance whenever $\mathcal{A}$ is Morita equivalent to coherent sheaves or matrix factorizations on a mirror variety/LG model, leading to many simplified proofs of homological mirror symmetry equivalences: In many situations it now suffices to find an embedding of coherent sheaves or matrix factorizations into the split-closed derived Fukaya category; our result says such embeddings will automatically be equivalences (when they have large enough HH^0 if $c_1(X) \neq 0$). This latter corollary generalizes a result of Perutz-Sheridan [**PS2**] proven for the case $c_1(X) = 0$.

1. Introduction

1.1. Main Result. A recent result of Perutz and Sheridan [**PS2**] shows that the (split-closed) derived Fukaya category of a compact Calabi-Yau manifold X satisfies a certain rigidity property expressed via mirror symmetry: any embedding of the derived category of coherent sheaves on some mirror Calabi-Yau variety Y is automatically a quasi-equivalence, meaning its image split-generates the Fukaya category.[1] From a concrete geometric perspective, any Lagrangian in X with non-vanishing Floer cohomology must intersect the Lagrangians in the image of any generating collection of sheaves.

The goal of our work is to establish more general rigidity, or *automatic split-generation*, properties for the Fukaya category of a closed symplectic manifold X, independent of mirror symmetry or the Calabi-Yau hypotheses (we note that the argument in [**PS2**] crucially requires $c_1(X) = 0$). Our argument, which is relatively short and completely different from the methods of [**PS2**], has the strongest consequence when $c_1(X) = 0$:

Theorem 1. *Let X be a symplectic manifold with $c_1(X) = 0$ and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)$ be a non-empty full subcategory of its ($\mathbb{Z}$-graded) Fukaya category over a field $\mathbb{K}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is* homologically smooth. *Then $\mathcal{A}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}(X)$.*

The author was supported by an NSF postdoctoral fellowship.

[1] In [**PS2**], Y is further required to be a family over some sort of formal disc with *maximally unipotent monodromy*.

(Homological) smoothness, a concept introduced by Kontsevich [**K**,**KS**] and recalled in Definition 18, is an algebraic finiteness condition amounting to possessing an algebraic resolution of the diagonal in the sense of Beilinson [**B**]. Smoothness is a Morita invariant notion, and generalizes a finiteness property possessed by the coordinate ring of a smooth complex affine variety. The key here is that smoothness of $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)$ is a condition manifestly *intrinsic* to $\mathcal{A}$ as an (A_∞ or dg) category, not requiring further study of the geometry of X. Furthermore, whenever $\mathcal{A}$ is Morita equivalent to a category of coherent sheaves or graded matrix factorizations on some scheme Y over $\mathbb{K}$, the homological smoothness hypotheses are automatically satisfied (see the discussions in §6), recovering in this former case the generation result in [**PS2**].[2]

The proof, which is a very short corollary of formal properties of Fukaya categories (none of which are new to this work), is valid for any construction of the Fukaya category which, along with the quantum cohomology $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$, satisfies axiomatics detailed in §2 - 4. In particular, the same techniques yield new automatic split-generation results in non-Calabi-Yau settings. As an example, let us suppose X is monotone (for instance, a Fano variety equipped with its monotone symplectic form). It is well known that the monotone Fukaya category of X splits into summands, denoted $\mathcal{F}_w$, indexed by eigenvalues w of the quantum multiplication operator $c_1(X) \star -$; see §2.4. Denoting by $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$ the corresponding generalized eigenspace of $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$, our main result in this case is:

THEOREM 2. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}_w$ be a full subcategory. Suppose that*

(1) *$\mathcal{A}$ is* homologically smooth*; and*
(2) *there is a rank inequality* $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}) \geq \mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{QH}^0(X)_w$*, where* $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{A})$ *denotes the* Hochschild cohomology *of $\mathcal{A}$ (see §3).*

Then $\mathcal{A}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}_w$ (and the inequality in (2) is an equality).

REMARK 3. The rank inequality (2) appearing in Theorem 2 is required when $c_1(X) = 0$ as well, but there it is automatically satisfied: the presence of a $\mathbb{Z}$-grading implies $\mathrm{rk}\ QH^0(X) = \mathrm{rk}\ H^0(X) = 1$, and $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1$ whenever $\mathcal{A}$ is non-empty (see Lemma 31).

When $c_1(X) \neq 0$, quantum cohomology is most generally only $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-graded, hence it is not necessarily true that $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{QH}^0(X)_w = 1$ (for instance, if there is only one summand at $w = 0$, and quantum cohomology is $\mathbb{Z}/2$-graded, then $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{QH}^0(X)_0 = \mathrm{rk}\ H^{even}(X)$). It is easy to find examples in the setting of Theorem 2 showing that the hypothesis (2) cannot be removed.

The relevant axiomatic properties of Fukaya categories required to prove Theorems 1 and 2 have been verified in geometric settings where there are classical constructions available, for instance for *relative Fukaya categories* of pairs $(X^{2n}, \mathbf{D})$ (where $\mathbf{D}$ is an ample simple normal crossings divisor representing $PD([\omega])$), or for *monotone Fukaya categories* of monotone symplectic manifolds. The proof of the most crucial of the properties we use, Theorem 30 below, will appear in [**GPS2**]. It is the author's understanding that a version of these axiomatic properties for general Fukaya categories, including Theorem 30, for $\mathbb{K} = \Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}$ the Novikov field over $\mathbb{C}$, will appear in [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$]. Assuming this, there is also a version of our result for general Fukaya categories, see Remark 33.[3]

REMARK 4. In Theorem 1, the ground field $\mathbb{K}$ most generally needs to be a version of the Novikov field. However, for various restricted classes of Lagrangians in restricted classes of (X, ω), one can take $\mathbb{K}$ to be a smaller field. For example, $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}((q))$ suffices for relative Fukaya categories, or $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{F}_p$ suffices in the monotone setting of Theorem 2; see §2.

REMARK 5. The methods described in this paper require the ambient symplectic manifold X and its Lagrangians to be compact; specifically the structures used require:

- finite rank Lagrangian Floer cohomology groups, which is a *properness* condition,

[2]Unlike [**PS2**], we do not not need to impose 'maximal unipotency' hypotheses on the candidate mirror Y, though this is an a posteriori consequence when working over Novikov fields; see Remark 36.

[3]Remark 22 discusses variations between the frameworks discussed here and [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$] as regards *Calabi-Yau structures*, which don't affect our main result.

- a version of Poincaré duality for Floer cohomology between compact Lagrangians, which is known as a *weak proper Calabi-Yau structure*, and
- a Poincaré duality non-degenerate self-pairing on the (quantum) cohomology of the total space.

Forthcoming work will address related results in wrapped and Landau-Ginzburg Fukaya categories (each of which have somewhat different hypotheses and are consequences of rather different geometric structures).

1.2. Open-closed maps. Our argument makes essential use of, and has non-trivial consequences for, geometric *open-closed* and *closed-open maps*, which relate the Hochschild invariants of the Fukaya category to quantum cohomology. To discuss these in a uniform setting for Calabi-Yau and monotone X, we temporarily suppress the summand decompositions which occur in quantum cohomology and Fukaya categories in the monotone case; see Remark 8 for how to put these back in.

Recall that there is a geometric *open-closed map* from the *Hochschild homology* of the Fukaya category, denoted $\mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}(X))$ to the *quantum cohomology* of X:

$$\mathcal{OC} : \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}(X)) \to \mathrm{QH}^*(X)$$

The importance of this map has highlighted by Abouzaid [**Abo**], who showed that any subcategory $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)$ for which $\mathcal{OC}|_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathrm{HH}_{-n}(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathrm{QH}^0(X)$ hits the unit $1 \in \mathrm{QH}^0(X)$ in fact split-generates $\mathcal{F}(X)$ (this is reviewed in §4). Our argument uses properties of open-closed maps and Fukaya categories to show that, under the hypotheses as in Theorems 1-2, Abouzaid's criterion is satisfied.

Following [**G1**], we call any $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying Abouzaid's criterion an *essential subcategory* (and say X is *non-degenerate* if it is has an essential collection). In fact, whenever one can find an essential subcategory $\mathcal{A}$, it is understood that one can entirely recover the quantum cohomology ring:

THEOREM 6 ([**G1**] for the wrapped Fukaya category, [**GPS1**], [**AFO**$^+$]). *If $\mathcal{F}(X)$ has an essential subcategory $\mathcal{A}$, then the open-closed and closed-open maps $\mathcal{OC} : \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}(X)) \cong \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ and $\mathcal{CO} : \mathrm{QH}^*(X) \to \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F}(X)) \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{A})$ are both isomorphisms.*[4]

Theorems 1 and 2 are proven by establishing that the given category $\mathcal{A}$ is essential; hence using Theorem 6 they imply:

COROLLARY 7. *Suppose the hypotheses of Theorems 1 or 2 are satisfied for a given subcategory $\mathcal{A}$ of the Fukaya category of X; namely $\mathcal{A}$ is homologically smooth, non-empty, and satisfies a rank inequality on its Hochschild cohomology if $c_1(X) \neq 0$ (see Theorem 2, (2)). Then, the closed-open and open-closed maps induce isomorphisms*

$$\mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}(X)) \cong \mathrm{QH}^*(X) \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F}(X)) \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{A}). \tag{1.1}$$

REMARK 8. When X is monotone, the above Corollary should strictly speaking be taken in a given summand corresponding to eigenvalues w of $c_1(X)\star -$. Given such a w, a version of Abouzaid's Theorem [**RS**, **Sh3**] says that if $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)_w$ and the open-closed map from $\mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{A})$ hits the projection 1_w of the unit onto the generalized w-eigenspace $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$, then $\mathcal{A}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}(X)_w$. Theorem 6 applies with the same proof. Hence, Corollary 7, under the hypothesis of Theorem 2, concludes that the open-closed maps between the w-summand $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$ and the Hochschild invariants of $\mathcal{F}(X)_w$ resp. $\mathcal{A}$ are isomorphisms.

REMARK 9. A further consequence of [**G2**] is that various *cyclic open-closed maps* from cyclic homology theories of the Fukaya category to corresponding *S^1-equivariant quantum cohomologies* (with respect to the trivial S^1 action) are also isomorphisms. This in particular this implies that on any smooth and proper subcategory of the Fukaya category of a compact symplectic manifold, the *non-commutative Hodge-to-de Rham spectral sequence* for $\mathcal{F}$ degenerates (compare [**KS**, Conj. 9.1.2]).

[4] The proof given in [**GPS1**] assumes $\mathcal{A}$ is smooth, which is sufficient for our purposes. But see Remark 10 and [**G1**] for a discussion of how smoothness of $\mathcal{A}$ should a posteriori follow from essentiality.

Going further, the works [**GPS1**, **GPS2**] imply that the cyclic open closed map intertwines a certain *variation of semi-infinite Hodge structures* on the cyclic homology of $\mathcal{F}(X)$ with the corresponding one on $QH^*(X)$. This implies, at least when $c_1(X) = 0$, the Fukaya category knows about genus 0 enumerative information in X.

REMARK 10. In [**G1**], a converse assertion was proven (in the setting of the wrapped Fukaya category) that if $\mathcal{A}$ is an essential subcategory meaning it satisfies Abouzaid's criterion, then $\mathcal{A}$ is homologically smooth. A version of the argument (which will appear elsewhere) carries over to the setting of compact Fukaya categories. In particular, such an argument would imply that a collection of Lagrangians only has a hope of satisfying Abouzaid's split-generation criterion (and hence computing $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ via $\mathcal{OC}$) if it has a homologically smooth Floer algebra. This gives some evidence that the smoothness hypotheses for automatic generation imposed in Theorems 1 and 2 are reasonable ones.

1.3. Overview. In §2, we review the quantum cohomology ring and versions of the Fukaya category of compact manifolds. In §3, we recall relevant algebraic structures, most notably the notions of split-generation and homological smoothness, Hochschild invariants, weak Calabi-Yau structures, and Shklyarov's categorical Mukai pairing on Hochschild homology (a key fact about this pairing being *non-degenerate* for homologically smooth categories is recalled in Proposition 21). §4 reviews various geometric structures, such as open-closed and closed open maps $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$, as well as relevant properties they should satisfy: the linear duality between $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ in the presence of a weak proper Calabi-Yau structure[5], Abouzaid's generation criterion, and the compatibility of open-closed maps with the Mukai pairing).

Combining these general structures with the homological algebra Lemma of Proposition 21, the proofs of the main Theorems, given in §5, are very short. In §6, we indicate just a few applications of our result, though we expect many more.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to the work and ideas of (and helpful conversations/collaborations with) T. Perutz and N. Sheridan, which contributed in two essential ways to this note: first, with the broad idea, appearing in [**PS2**] that there could be intrinsically checkable conditions on Fukaya algebras which might sometimes, through the structure of open-closed maps, imply generation, and second, with the specific observation, appearing in the joint project [**GPS1**], that homological smoothness of a Fukaya algebra of compact Lagrangians in a compact symplectic manifold implies injectivity of the open-closed map. I would like to thank K. Fukaya for explaining to me the result from [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$] that distinct summands in general Fukaya categories map orthogonally to quantum cohomology (which in turn helped clarify automatic generation statements in that setting, see Remark 33), and M. Abouzaid for helpful conversations. I would also like to thanks Andrew Hanlon and Chris Woodward for corrections on an earlier draft.

After the first draft of this paper was complete, I learned that a version of the main results of this paper have been obtained independently by F. Sanda.

2. The Fukaya category and quantum cohomology

Let (X^{2n}, ω) denote a symplectic manifold. We say X is *(positively) monotone* if $c_1(X) = \lambda[\omega]$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and *Calabi-Yau* if $c_1(X) = 0$. Let $\mathbb{K}$ denote a coefficient field, and let G be an abelian group.

[5]While our argument does use in an essential way the weak proper Calabi-Yau structure on the Fukaya category, our main Theorem does not require $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ to be linear duals; this is only used for Corollary 7.

2.1. Quantum cohomology. The (small) quantum cohomology [**RT**, **MS**] of X

$$(\mathrm{QH}^*(X;\mathbb{K}),\star)$$

is naturally a $\mathbb{Z}/2N$ graded ring, where N is the minimal Chern number of X (when $c_1(X)=0$, $\mathrm{QH}^*(X;\mathbb{K})$ is $\mathbb{Z}$-graded). As a vector space $\mathrm{QH}^*(X;\mathbb{K})$ is equal to the cohomology of X with its grading collapsed. Quantum cohomology comes equipped with its cohomological non-degenerate integration pairing

$$\begin{aligned}\langle -,-\rangle_X : \mathrm{QH}^*(X;\mathbb{K})\otimes \mathrm{QH}^*(X;\mathbb{K}) &\to \mathbb{K}\\ \langle \alpha,\beta\rangle_X &:= \int_X \alpha\cup\beta;\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

the quantum product $\star$ can be described in terms of the corresponding 'three-point functions'

$$(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)_X := \langle \alpha\star\beta,\gamma\rangle_X,$$

which are given by counts of rigid J-holomorphic spheres in X with three marked points constrained to lie on Poincaré dual cycles to α, β, and γ respectively. Notably, a given rigid J-holomorphic sphere u is counted with weight

$$t^{\omega(u)} \tag{2.2}$$

for a chosen $t\in\mathbb{K}$. We will make a *well-definedness* and *convergence assumption* that $(\mathbb{K},t)$ are chosen so that

(1) (well-definedness) every $t^{\omega(u)}$ is an element of $\mathbb{K}$; and
(2) (convergence) for any triple α,β,γ, the sum of $t^{\omega(u)}$ over all J-holomorphic spheres u described above is an element of $\mathbb{K}$.

Often the convergence hypothesis can only be guaranteed by picking t to be a formal variable in a Novikov-type field $\mathbb{K}$, where then convergence is meant in the adic sense and holds as a consequence of Gromov compactness. Examples of $(\mathbb{K},t)$ satisfying the well-definedness and convergence assumptions depend on X; some examples include:

- For any symplectic manifold, one can take $\mathbb{K}$ to be the Novikov field
$$\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}_{Nov} := \{\sum a_i q^{\lambda_i} | a_i\in\mathbb{C}, \lambda_i\in\mathbb{R}, \lim_{i\to\infty}\lambda_i = +\infty\}$$
and weight $t=q$.
- If X is Calabi-Yau (or monotone), and $[\omega]$ is an *integral* symplectic form, one can take $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{C}((q))$ with $|q|=2c_1(X)$, and weight $t=q$.
- If X is (positively) monotone, one can take $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{C}$ (or $\mathbb{K}$ another small field, such as $\mathbb{Z}_2$ or $\mathbb{F}_p$), and weight $t=1$.

The count of constant spheres factors in a classical contribution $\int_X\alpha\cup\beta\cup\gamma$; so quantum cohomology is a deformation of the usual cohomology ring. The quantum cup product is associative.

When X is not Calabi-Yau, quantum cup product with the first Chern class $c_1(X)\star -$ gives an interesting degree zero endomorphism of the quantum cohomology ring, inducing a generalized eigenspace decomposition.

2.2. The Fukaya category, schematically. The Fukaya category, as most generally defined [**FOOO1**, **FOOO2**, **AFO**$^+$] associates to a compact symplectic manifold X a A_∞ category $\mathcal{F}(X)$ over a version of the Novikov field $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}_{Nov} := \{\sum_i a_i q^{\lambda_i} | a_i\in\mathbb{C}, \lambda_i\in\mathbb{R}, \lambda_i\to\infty\}$. Its objects are Lagrangian branes (meaning Lagrangians equipped with relative Spin structures, local systems, and potentially grading data when $c_1(X)=0$), its morphism spaces are generated as graded $\Lambda^{\mathbb{C}}_{Nov}$ vector spaces by intersection points between Lagrangians, and the differential (and A_∞ structure maps) $\mu^k : \hom(L_{k-1},L_k)\otimes\cdots\otimes\hom(L_0,L_1)\to\hom(L_0,L_k)$ are given by counts of rigid $J-$holomorphic discs u, each such disc u's count weighted by $q^{\omega(u)}$. In fact, most generally $\mathcal{F}(X)$ is a *curved* A_∞ *category*; there is an additional element $\mu^0_L\in\hom(L,L)$ obstructing the differential μ^1_L squaring to

zero; one can pass to a genuine A_∞ category by considering *unobstructed* or *weakly unobstructed* objects (or more generally, objects equipped with *weak bounding co-chains*—see i.e., [**FOOO3**]).

As sketched above, the full Fukaya category requires a fair bit of analytic *virtual* machinery to extract counts μ^k satisfying A_∞ relations, due to the frequent inability to obtain transversely cut out moduli spaces. Under suitable geometric hypotheses, there are simpler, more classical methods of producing transversally cut out moduli spaces, and hence the A_∞ category structure. We will focus on two well known such constructions, one the *relative Fukaya category* [**Se1**, **Se8**, **Sh2**, **PS1**] of an integral symplectic Calabi-Yau or monotone symplectic manifold, and another the *monotone Fukaya category* of a monotone symplectic manifold [**O1**, **O2**, **O3**, **BC**, **Sh3**] (which in turn are defined along the lines of exact Fukaya categories as in [**Se3**]).

2.3. The relative Fukaya category of a Calabi-Yau manifold. We recall/sketch the definition of relative Fukaya categories as is given in [**PS1**]. Let X denote a closed integral symplectic manifold, and $\mathbf{D}$ a simple normal crossings divisor representing $[\omega]$. Fix a primitive α for the symplectic form ω on the the complement $X\backslash\mathbf{D}$ which is *Liouville*, in that the associated vector field Z is outward pointing along a contact neighborhood of $\mathbf{D}$. Objects of the *relative Fukaya category of* $(X, \mathbf{D})$ are Lagrangian branes as before which are exact in $X\backslash\mathbf{D}$, and moreover come equipped with fixed primitives of α. The A_∞ structure maps are defined as before, using a special type of almost complex structure adapted to $\mathbf{D}$, with each disc u weighted by area $q^{\omega(u)-\alpha(\partial u)}$ (note that this is now a positive integral weight). In the special case that each component of $\mathbf{D}$ is itself ample, studied in [**Sh2**], one counts discs using an almost complex structure J which preserves each component D, and this weight simply records the (positive) intersection multiplicity of u with $\mathbf{D}$. By the notation

$$\mathcal{F}(X, \mathbf{D})$$

we mean the *unobstructed* (or even weakly unobstructed) sub-category of the Fukaya category; i.e., those objects with μ^0 central, so one can talk about Floer cohomology.

Remark 11. More generally, one should consider the enlargement $\mathcal{F}_{mc}(X, \mathbf{D})$ whose objects consist pairs (L, b) of a potentially obstructed object L equipped with a *weak bounding co-chains*, in the sense mentioned previously. Our discussion applies verbatim to these larger categories, which also have well defined cohomological morphism spaces.

2.4. The monotone Fukaya category and monotone quantum cohomology. Suppose instead X is a monotone symplectic manifold; specifically, say $[\omega] = 2\tau c_1$ for $\tau > 0$. In this case, the quantum cohomology $\mathrm{QH}^*(X) := \mathrm{QH}^*(X, \mathbb{K})$ of X with $\mathbb{K}$ coefficients is $\mathbb{Z}/2$ graded[6], and as mentioned earlier the operator $c_1(X) \star -$ induces a decomposition of $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ into generalized eigenspaces $\mathrm{QH}^*_w(X)$, where $w \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}$ is an element of the algebraic closure.

A Lagrangian $L \subset X$ is said to be *monotone* if there is a constant $\rho > 0$ so that $\omega(-) = \rho\mu_L(-) : H_2(M, L) \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\omega(-)$ denotes symplectic area and $\mu_L(-)$ denotes the *Maslov class*. The *monotone Fukaya category* of X is defined over $\mathbb{C}$ (or more generally other small fields $\mathbb{K}$ or rings, for instance fields with finite characteristic), and has as objects monotone Lagrangians L with minimal Maslov number ≥ 2 equipped as before with *brane data*: relative Spin structures if char $\mathbb{K} \neq 2$, $\mathbb{Z}/2$ grading data, and $\mathbb{C}^*$ (resp. $\bar{\mathbb{K}}^*$)-local system. Objects can also more generally be equipped with *weak bounding co-chains* (see [**FOOO3**] or [**Sh3**] in the monotone case).

Remark 12. When the minimal Chern number of X is $N > 2$, and k is a number dividing N, one can consider the $\mathbb{Z}/2k$ graded version of the above story with objects Lagrangians with minimal Maslov number $\geq 2k$ equipped with $\mathbb{Z}/2k$ grading data. Our results are identical in this case (with the caveat that $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ should also be thought of as $\mathbb{Z}/2k$ graded in Theorem 2).

[6]Rather, it is $\mathbb{Z}/2N$ graded as mentioned above, but we reduce gradings to $\mathbb{Z}/2$, or whichever $\mathbb{Z}/2k$ grading we are putting on the Fukaya category.

Given a monotone Lagrangian with brane data, the *count of Maslov 2 (J-holomorphic) discs* in X with boundary on L (potentially weighted by the $\mathbb{C}^*/\bar{\mathbb{K}}^*$ local system) associates a numerical quantity

$$n_L \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}.$$

For each $w \in \bar{\mathbb{K}}$, there is a summand of the monotone Fukaya category

$$\mathcal{F}_w(X)$$

consisting of Lagrangians (or more generally idempotents of Lagrangians) with $n_L = w$. Within each summand, the A_∞ structure is defined as before; the main point in verifying the A_∞ equations in this case is that all potentially problematic disc bubbles (which do not occur as codimension 1 boundary of higher A_∞ moduli spaces, but may obstruct $(\mu^1)^2 = 0$ [**O1**, **O3**]) can be counted and in fact cancel.

A fundamental relationship between the categories $\mathcal{F}_w(X)$ and quantum multiplication by $c_1(X)$, deducible from studying the *cap product* action of $c_1(X) \in \mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ on $HF^*(L,L)$ (or equivalently from a closed-open map), valid only in monotone Fukaya categories, is

Proposition 13 (Auroux [**Au**], Kontsevich, Seidel). *$\mathcal{F}_w(X)$ is trivial unless w is an eigenvalue of $c_1(X) \star - : \mathrm{QH}^*(X, \mathbb{K}) \to \mathrm{QH}^*(X, \mathbb{K})$.*

See also [**Sh3**, Cor. 2.9] for an exposition.

3. Categorical structures

3.1. Bimodules and properness. Given a pair of A_∞ categories $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, there is an associated dg category of A_∞ $\mathcal{C}$–$\mathcal{D}$ bimodules[7], which we denote $\mathcal{C}-\mathrm{mod}-\mathcal{D}$. This category by now many references [**Se2**, **T**, **G1**, **Sh1**], so we will not provide explicit formulae for the objects and morphisms of this category. Schematically, an A_∞ $\mathcal{C}$–$\mathcal{D}$ bimodule is a 'bilinear functor' $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{D} \to Chain_{\mathbb{K}}$ to chain complexes; meaning, for every pair of objects $(V, W) \in \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{C} \times \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{D}$, there is a chain complex $\mathcal{B}(V, W)$, along with 'multiplication maps' coming from the induced map on morphism spaces:

$$\mu_{\mathcal{B}}^{r|1|s} : \left(\hom_{\mathcal{C}}(V_{r-1}, V_r) \otimes \cdots \otimes \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(V_0, V_1) \right) \otimes \left(\hom_{\mathcal{D}}(W_1, W_0) \otimes \cdots \otimes \hom_{\mathcal{D}}(W_s, W_{s-1}) \right) \longrightarrow \hom_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{B}(V_0, W_0), \mathcal{B}(V_r, W_s)),$$

satisfying equations coming from the A_∞ 'bilinear functor' relations (see [**Ly**] or more recently [**Sh1**] for the formal perspective using multilinear functors).

Remark 14. The main property of a bimodule we will study, *perfection*, is a Morita invariant notion. Hence the reader should feel free to replace all instances of 'A_∞' by 'dg' in the formal discussion (one caveat: when $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are dg categories, the correct morphism spaces of dg bimodules in $\mathcal{C}-\mathrm{mod}-\mathcal{D}$ are the derived bimodule homomorphisms). More precisely, any A_∞ category can be replaced by an equivalent, hence Morita equivalent, dg category, and any A_∞ bimodule over a dg category can be replaced by an equivalent dg bimodule (which is a bilinear dg functor to chain complexes).

Important examples of bimodules for our purposes include:

- *Yoneda bimodules*: for a pair of objects $(K, L) \in \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{C} \times \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{D}$, the K, L Yoneda bimodule, denoted $Y_{K,L}$, is the tensor product of the left Yoneda module over K with the right Yoneda module over L, and associates the following chain complex, for $(A, B) \in \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{C} \times \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{D}$:

  $$Y_{K,L}(A, B) := \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(K, A) \otimes \hom_{\mathcal{D}}(B, L).$$

  Yoneda bimodules are the analog of *free bimodules* over categories (specifically, in the category of $A-B$ bimodules, where A and B are A_∞ algebras, the analogous bimodule is $A \otimes B^{op}$).

[7] We will particularly consider the case $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{D}$.

- the *diagonal bimodule* $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is a $\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}$ bimodule, which as a chain complex is
$$\mathcal{C}_\Delta(A,B) := \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(B,A).$$
In the case of an A_∞ algebra A, the diagonal bimodule A_Δ is A thought of as a bimodule over itself.
- the *(linear) dual diagonal bimodule* $\mathcal{C}^\vee_\Delta$ is a $\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}$ bimodule, which as a chain complex is
$$\mathcal{C}^\vee_\Delta(A,B) := \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(B,A)^\vee$$
(where the dual is taken with respect to the ground field $\mathbb{K}$).

It is natural to ask whether a bimodule, thought of as a bilinear functor, actually takes values in the subcategory $perf(\mathbb{K}) \subset Chain_{\mathbb{K}}$ of chain complexes with finite rank cohomology.

DEFINITION 15. *A bimodule $\mathcal{B}$ is* proper *if for any pair of objects (X,Y), the total cohomology $H^*(\mathcal{B}(X,Y))$ is finite rank over $\mathbb{K}$.*

DEFINITION 16. *An A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ is* proper *if the total cohomology $H^*(\hom_{\mathcal{C}}(X,Y))$ is finite rank over $\mathbb{K}$, or equivalently if its diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is proper.*

It is easy to see that Fukaya categories of compact Lagrangians are always proper; for instance, the Floer co-chain complex of a pair of transverse compact Lagrangians L_0, L_1 is by definition a vector space whose dimension is the (finite) set of intersection points of the pair.[8]

3.2. Split-generation and perfect bimodules. For any A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$, denote by $perf(\mathcal{C})$ the split-closed pre-triangulated envelope of $\mathcal{C}$. There are multiple ways of constructing this envelope — each of which comes equipped with a cohomologically full and faithful embedding $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow perf(\mathcal{C})$ — but all choices are quasi-equivalent (see [**Se3**, §4c], where the notation $\Pi Tw(\mathcal{C})$ is often favored; elsewhere $tw^\pi\mathcal{C}$ sometimes appears[9]). For any full sub-category $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{C}$, there is a corresponding cohomologically full and faithful embedding $perf(\mathcal{X}) \hookrightarrow perf(\mathcal{C})$. We say $\mathcal{X}$ *split-generates* $\mathcal{C}$ if this embedding is a quasi-equivalence. Equivalently, in $H^0(perf(\mathcal{C}))$, every object of $\mathcal{C}$ should be isomorphic to an object of $perf(\mathcal{X})$, meaning each object admits a homologically left invertible morphism into some (finite) complex of objects from $\mathcal{X}$.

Applying this definition to categories of bimodules, we have:

DEFINITION 17. *A $\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}$ bimodule $\mathcal{B}$ is* perfect *if, in the category of $\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}$ bimodules, it is split-generated by Yoneda bimodules.*

3.3. Homological smoothness. We come to the main algebraic finiteness condition appearing in Theorems 1 and 2.

DEFINITION 18 ([**K**, **KS**]). *A category $\mathcal{C}$ is* (homologically) smooth *if its diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is a perfect bimodule, in the sense of Definition 17.*

We say (for the purposes of this paper) that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are *Morita equivalent* if there is a quasi-equivalence $perf(\mathcal{C}) \cong perf(\mathcal{D})$ (for instance, this holds whenever there is an embedding $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{D}$ which split-generates). Morita equivalent categories have quasi-equivalent bimodule categories and in particular, notions of perfectness coincide, hence:

PROPOSITION 19. *Smoothness is a* Morita-invariant *notion; that is, if $\mathcal{C}$ is homologically smooth, and $\mathcal{D}$ is Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{C}$, then then $\mathcal{D}$ is homologically smooth. In particular, if a full subcategory $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{C}$ split-generates, then $\mathcal{X}$ is smooth if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is.*

[8]When L_0 is not transverse to L_1, $\hom_{\mathcal{F}(X)}(L_0, L_1)$ is at least quasi-isomorphic to a chain complex generated by the finitely many (transverse) intersection points of a perturbation $\tilde{L}_0$ with L_1. In some technical setups, this is in fact taken as the definition of $\hom_{\mathcal{F}(X)}(L_0, L_1)$, for a suitable $\tilde{L}_0$.

[9]tw or Tw refers to a particular construction of such an envelope known as *twisted complexes*, with π/Π superscript or prefix to indicate the split-closure. The notation $perf(\mathcal{C})$ references another construction, known as *perfect modules*.

A special case of this definition applies to the case of an ordinary associative or dg algebra A (which arises when $\mathcal{C}$ has only one object X, with $\mu^k = 0$ for $k \geq 3$, by setting $A := \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(X, X)$). In that case, A is *homologically smooth* if A is split generated by $A \otimes A^{op}$ in the category of $A \otimes A^{op}$ modules, e.g., A-bimodules. It is well known for instance that if $A = R$ is a commutative ring over $\mathbb{C}$, then A is smooth if and only if $Y = Spec\ R$ is smooth in the usual geometric sense. Proposition 19 implies that in fact the (geometric) smoothness of Y is equivalent to the smoothness of any Morita equivalent algebra A', such as the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices $Mat_{n\times n}(R)$.

Besides directly verifying the definition of smoothness, there are frequently geometric and topological means of recognizing homologically smooth algebras and categories, for instance:

- As mentioned above, it is well known that the coordinate ring of an affine variety $\mathbb{C}[Y]$ is smooth if and only if Y is geometrically smooth (see e.g., [**KS**, Ex. 8.1.4a]).
- More generally, the category of perfect complexes $Perf(Y)$ on any variety Y is homologically smooth if and only if Y is geometrically smooth [**Lu**].
- The category of coherent complexes on Y, $Coh(Y)$ is always homologically smooth[10] [**Lu**].
- Matrix factorization categories $MF(Y, W)$ are always homologically smooth [**D**, **P**, **LP**].
- The singular chains on the based loop space of a space X, $C_{-*}(\Omega X)$ (cohomologically graded by our conventions), is a dg algebra[11] with composition induced by concatenation of loops. $C_{-*}(\Omega X)$ is homologically smooth whenever X is homotopy equivalent to a finite CW complex (see [**FHT**, Proposition 5.3] or the more recent [**Abb**, §3.2]).

3.4. Hochschild invariants. To a (small) cohomologically unital A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ over a field $\mathbb{K}$, a standard purely algebraic construction associates *Hochschild homology*

$$\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$$

and *Hochschild cohomology*

$$\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C})$$

groups, both Morita invariants of $\mathcal{C}$ (implicitly over $\mathbb{K}$). The Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C})$ is a unital ring and Hochschild homology $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$ is a module over $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C})$.[12] We adopt the convention that both $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$ and $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C})$ are cohomologically graded, so that the product and module structure maps are degree zero maps. Explicit formulae for these algebraic constructions can be found in many places, see i.e., [**Se2**, **G1**, **Sh1**]. Hochschild homology is functorial in $\mathcal{C}$, meaning that an A_∞ functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ (or more generally a perfect $\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{D}$ bimodule) induces a pushforward map $F_* : \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{D})$. For dg categories, Hochschild homology satisfies a Künneth formulae: $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{D})$ (a similar statement can be made for A_∞ categories, modulo a discussion the notion of tensor product for A_∞ categories).

Both groups are special cases of a construction which associates, to a bimodule $\mathcal{B}$ over $\mathcal{C}$, Hochschild homology and cohomology groups $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$, $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B})$ (we are using the shorthand $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) := \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_\Delta)$ and $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C}) := \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_\Delta)$). Even more generally, they can be thought of as (cohomological) morphisms and/or tensor products associated to the category of $\mathcal{C}$–$\mathcal{C}$ bimodules. For instance, we have isomorphisms $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \cong H^*(\hom_{\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C}_\Delta, \mathcal{B}))$ and $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{B}) \cong H^*(\mathcal{C}_\Delta \otimes^{\mathbb{L}}_{\mathcal{C}-\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B})$.

3.5. Weak proper Calabi-Yau structures. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a *proper* A_∞ category, in the sense of Definition 16. A *weak proper Calabi-Yau (wpCY) structure of dimension n* on $\mathcal{C}$ is a quasi-isomorphism of bimodules

$$\mathcal{C}_\Delta \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{C}^\vee[-n]. \tag{3.1}$$

[10] Note that $Coh(Y) \cong Perf(Y)$ if and only if Y is smooth.

[11] This is an A_∞ rather than dg algebra if one doesn't use *Moore loops*, but the discussion still applies.

[12] Moreover, there are Gerstenhaber algebra/module structures, as well as other *non-commutative calculus* structures not discussed here.

Roughly speaking (3.1) is the data of a chain-level map realizing a Poincaré duality type isomorphism $H^* \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(X,Y) \cong H^{n-*} \hom_{\mathcal{C}}(Y,X)$, along with a family of chosen higher homotopies realizing the homotopy-compatibility of this quasi-isomorphism with A_∞ multiplications.

A wpCY structure induces a linear duality between certain Hochschild invariants:

LEMMA 20. *If $\mathcal{C}$ has a weak proper Calabi-Yau structure of dimension n, then* $\mathrm{HH}_{n-*}(\mathcal{C})^\vee \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C})$.

PROOF. For any $\mathcal{C}$ there are canonical identifications $\mathrm{HH}^{*-n}(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}^\vee) \cong \mathrm{HH}_{n-*}(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}_\Delta)^\vee := \mathrm{HH}_{n-*}(\mathcal{C})^\vee$ (the isomorphism can even be realized on the level of chain complexes). Next, the wpCY structure induces an isomorphism $\mathrm{HH}^{*-n}(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}^\vee) \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}_\Delta) := \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{C})$. □

3.6. The categorical Mukai pairing. Associated to any proper A_∞ category $\mathcal{C}$ over a field $\mathbb{K}$ is a canonical pairing on its Hochschild homology, called the *(categorical) Mukai pairing*:

$$\langle -,- \rangle_{Muk} : \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathbb{K}. \tag{3.2}$$

Roughly, any *proper* bimodule $\mathcal{B}$ (see Def. 15), which is a bilinear functor $\mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \to perf(\mathbb{K}) \subset Chain_{\mathbb{K}}$, induces a map $\mathcal{B}_* : \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \to \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op} \otimes \mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{B}} \mathrm{HH}_*(perf(\mathbb{K})) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{K}$; the Mukai pairing is the composition of this map with the natural isomorphism $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op}) \cong \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$. When $\mathcal{C}$ is proper, the diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is proper, and the Mukai pairing $\langle -,- \rangle_{Muk}$ is then defined as $(\mathcal{C}_\Delta)_*$. For the general theory above (specifically involving expressions like "$\mathcal{C}^{op} \otimes \mathcal{C}$") to work most simply, we can assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is a dg category, as the resulting pairing is independent of the quasi-equivalence class of $\mathcal{C}$ and any A_∞ category is quasi-equivalent to a dg category. There are direct methods of defining this pairing when $\mathcal{C}$ is an A_∞ category, using the notion of *multilinear A_∞ functors* [**Ly**] to resolve issues with tensor products. This leads to compact formulae for the pairing for an A_∞ category with finite dimensional chain-level morphism spaces; see [**Sh1**] (and also work of Abouzaid-Fukaya-Oh-Ohta-Ono [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$]).

The key consequence of smoothness of $\mathcal{C}$ is the following result of Shklyarov (we draw upon the concise discussion in [**Se5**, Lecture 8]).

PROPOSITION 21 ([**Shk**], where the result is attributed to Kontsevich-Soibelman). *If $\mathcal{C}$ is smooth and proper, then its Hochschild homology is finite rank and the Mukai pairing is a non-degenerate pairing.*

SKETCH OF PROOF. The main idea is to show that for any perfect bimodule $\mathcal{B}$, there is a 'Chern character' map:

$$CH_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathbb{K} \to \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op}),$$

such that when $\mathcal{B}$ is also proper, the composition

$$\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{CH_{\mathcal{B}}(1)\otimes id} \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \xrightarrow{id\otimes\langle -,-\rangle_{Muk}} \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \tag{3.3}$$

is simply the functoriality map on Hochschild homology induced by the convolution functor $-\otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B} : perf(\mathcal{C}) \to perf(\mathcal{C})$ (using the Morita invariance property $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathrm{HH}_*(perf(\mathcal{C}))$. When $\mathcal{C}$ is smooth and proper, the diagonal bimodule $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}_\Delta$ is perfect and proper, hence the above applies. In this case, the overall composition (3.3) is the identity and the second map is (up to the identification $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op})$) $id \otimes \langle -,- \rangle_{Muk}$, which immediately implies that $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$ is finite dimensional and that $\langle -,- \rangle_{Muk}$ is non-degenerate on the left.[13] To clarify, letting $\sigma = CH_{\mathcal{C}_\Delta}(1) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \otimes \beta_i$ thought of as an element of $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$, the above implies that, for any $v \in \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C})$,

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \cdot \langle \beta_i, v \rangle_{Muk}.$$

A similar argument on the right or an appeal to symmetry of $\langle -,- \rangle_{Muk}$ when $\mathcal{C}$ is weak Calabi-Yau (see i.e., [**Sh1**, Lem. 5.43]) implies non-degeneracy on the right.

[13] This argument is an instance of the *Snake relation* in topological field theory.

Finally, the map $CH_{\mathcal{B}}$ exists for formal reasons: any object of a category $\mathcal{D}$ determines a functor $\mathbb{K} \to \mathcal{D}$ and hence a map $\mathbb{K} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathbb{K}) \to \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{D})$. A similar construction associates an element of $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{D})$ to any object of $perf(\mathcal{D})$ using the fact that $\mathrm{HH}_*(perf(\mathcal{D})) \cong \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{D})$. To apply this to our situation, note that the category of perfect bimodules over $\mathcal{C}$ is quasi-isomorphic to $perf(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{op})$; in turn, there is a Künneth formula $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{C}^{op}) \cong \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{C}^{op})$ (again, for simplicity, this discussion assumes $\mathcal{C}$ is dg so there are no issues with tensor products). □

4. Geometric structures

In this section, we recall formal structures possessed by the Fukaya category and quantum cohomology, primarily concerning *open-closed maps* relating the Hochschild homology and cohomology of the Fukaya category with quantum cohomology. These structures have been established in a number of settings, and in other technical or geometric setups could be viewed as axiomatic requirements for our result to hold. As usual we suppress the summand decompositions that occur in the monotone/non-Calabi-Yau case from the general discussion (except to highlight differences). So when X is monotone, all instances of $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ should be replaced with $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$, and instances of $\mathcal{F}(X)$ should be replaced with $\mathcal{F}_w(X)$.

4.1. Weak proper Calabi-Yau structure. The Fukaya category carries a canonical weak proper Calabi-Yau structure, in the sense of §3.5. Specifically, the wpCY structure gives a first-order chain-level refinement of the Poincaré duality pairing on Lagrangian Floer cohomology;

$$HF^*(L_0, L_1) \cong HF^*(L_1, L_0)^\vee[-n]. \tag{4.1}$$

On the chain level, the map $HF^*(L_0, L_1) \otimes HF^*(L_1, L_0) \to \mathbb{K}[-n]$ comes from counts of (unstable) J-holomorphic strips with two inputs, or equivalently, from counts of J-holomorphic discs with two boundary marked points and one unconstrained interior marked point with fixed cross ratio. The higher order data in this structure has a similar definition (see [**Se3**, (12j)], [**Se4**, Proof of Prop. 5.1] and more recently, [**Sh3**, §2.8]).

It follows from Lemma 20 that on the Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}$ (or any summand in the monotone case), there are canonical isomorphisms $\mathrm{HH}_{n-*}(\mathcal{F})^\vee \cong \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F})$.

Remark 22. There are two possible further refinements of a weak proper Calabi-Yau structure. In [**F**, **AFO**$^+$], a version of the Fukaya category is constructed (for fields $\mathbb{K}$ containing $\mathbb{R}$) which is a *(strictly) cyclic A_∞ category*, meaning that certain correlation functions $\langle \mu^k(-, \cdots, -), - \rangle$ are graded cyclically symmetric on the chain level, for some perfect pairing $\langle -, - \rangle : \hom^*_{\mathcal{F}}(X, Y) \otimes \hom^*_{\mathcal{F}}(Y, X) \to \mathbb{K}[-n]$. Strictly cyclic A_∞ categories in particular possess weak proper Calabi-Yau structures (induced by $\langle -, - \rangle$), so our arguments still apply.

Over more general $\mathbb{K}$, such as cases in which the Fukaya category can be defined over a field or ring of finite characteristic, it may not be possible to guarantee the wpCY structure comes from strictly cyclic A_∞ structure. Instead one can show it is "cyclic up to homotopy". More precisely, the Fukaya category can be equipped with a *(strong) proper Calabi-Yau structure* ([**G2**], c.f. the discussion in [**GPS1**, §6.2]), in the sense of Kontsevich-Soibelman [**KS**]. Over a field of characteristic zero, a proper Calabi-Yau structure determines a quasi-isomorphism to a unique (isomorphism class) of cyclic A_∞ category [**KS**, Thm. 10.2.2], so in that case the notions are essentially equivalent.

4.2. The open-closed and closed-open maps. There is an open-closed map from the Hochschild homology of the Fukaya category to quantum cohomology

$$\mathcal{OC} : \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{QH}^*(X). \tag{4.2}$$

There is a complementary closed-open map, from the quantum cohomology of X to the Hochschild cohomology of the Fukaya category:

$$\mathcal{CO} : \mathrm{QH}^*(X) \to \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F}). \tag{4.3}$$

REMARK 23. In the monotone case, it is known by work of Ritter and Smith [**RS**] (see also [**Sh3**]) that both $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ respect eigen-summand summand decompositions; namely $\mathcal{CO}$ restricted to $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$ is zero except for the portion mapping to $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F}_w(X))$ and $\mathcal{OC}$ from $\mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}_w(X))$ has image in $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$.

In either case, the maps are associated to counts of discs with boundary marked points and one interior marked point, constrained to go through a (pseudo- or Morse) cycle in the ambient manifold. In (4.2), the interior marked point is the sole output, whereas in (4.3), one of the boundary marked points is the sole output. It may seem from this that the structure coefficients of either map should be therefore identical on the chain level; however, recall that to define counts one has to potentially perturb the defining equations in a coherent way compatible with boundary strata operations. These perturbation schemes and their compatibility conditions are in general quite different for $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$. Instead, for a compact manifold, $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ can be related cohomologically as follows.

First, dualizing $\mathcal{OC}$, one obtains a map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{OC}^\vee : \mathrm{QH}^*(X)^\vee &\to \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F})^\vee \\ \alpha &\mapsto \langle \alpha, \mathcal{OC}(-)\rangle_X. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Using the pairing in quantum cohomology to map $\mathrm{QH}^{*-2n}(X) \to \mathrm{QH}^*(X)^\vee$, we obtain a map:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{OC}_1^\vee : \mathrm{QH}^*(X) &\to \mathrm{HH}_{*+n}(\mathcal{F})^\vee \\ \mathcal{OC}_1^\vee(\alpha) &:= \mathcal{OC}^\vee \circ \langle \alpha, - \rangle := \langle \alpha, \mathcal{OC}(-)\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Since $\mathcal{F}$ has a weak proper Calabi-Yau structure, Lemma 20 provides an isomorphism $\phi : \mathrm{HH}_{*+n}(\mathcal{F})^\vee \to \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F})$. The desired relationship, which roughly comes from a "deformation of perturbation data argument," is then:

PROPOSITION 24 ([**AFO**$^+$, **Sh3**, **PS1**]). *As cohomology level maps,* $\phi \circ \mathcal{OC}_1^\vee \cong \mathcal{CO} : QH^*(X) \to \mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{F})$.

Namely, modulo identifications of codomains and domains, $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ are linear dual maps.

REMARK 25. In the strictly cyclic framework of [**AFO**$^+$], $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ can be set up to be linear dual on the chain level.

COROLLARY 26. *$\mathcal{OC}$ is an isomorphism if and only if $\mathcal{CO}$ is.*

Finally, a well known aspect of compatibility of $\mathcal{OC}$ and $\mathcal{CO}$ with algebraic structures is

PROPOSITION 27 ([**Se1**, **G1**, **RS**]). *$\mathcal{CO}$ is an algebra homomorphism, and with respect to the $\mathcal{CO}$-induced module structure of $\mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F})$ over $QH^*(X)$, $\mathcal{OC}$ is a $QH^*(X)$ module homomorphism.*

4.3. Abouzaid's split-generation criterion. In [**Abo**], Abouzaid introduced a criterion, in terms of the open-closed map, for when a collection of Lagrangian branes split-generates the Fukaya category. Though the original criterion was written for the wrapped Fukaya category of a Liouville manifold, the statement and its proof are essentially the same in other contexts (with some modifications to account for eigenvalue decompositions in the monotone case). This criterion has been implemented in the monotone setting in work of Ritter-Smith [**RS**] and Sheridan [**Sh3**], and will be implemented for relative Fukaya categories of Calabi-Yau or monotone manifolds by Perutz-Sheridan [**PS1**].

THEOREM 28 (Generation criterion, [**Abo**]). *Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)$ be a full subcategory. If the map $\mathcal{OC}|_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathrm{HH}_{-n}(\mathcal{B}) \to QH^0(X)$ contains the unit e in its image, then $\mathcal{B}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}(X)$.*

In the monotone case, while the above Theorem suitably interpreted is valid without passing to summands, it is more useful to have a version for a single summand of the Fukaya category at a time. Fix some field $\mathbb{K}$ and grading group G and consider quantum cohomology and the Fukaya category with G grading over $\mathbb{K}$.

THEOREM 29 (Generation criterion, monotone variant, [**RS**, **Sh3**]). *Let w be a generalized eigenvalue of $c_1(X) \star -$, and denote by e_w the projection of the unit e to the generalized w eigenspace $QH^0(X)_w$. Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{F}_w(X)$ be a full subcategory of the monotone Fukaya category summand corresponding to w. If the map $\mathcal{OC}|_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathrm{HH}_{-n}(\mathcal{B}) \to QH^0_w(X)$ hits e_w, then $\mathcal{B}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}_w(X)$.*

4.4. Compatibility with Mukai pairing. The newest feature of the open-closed map $\mathcal{OC}$ which is crucial to our argument is the compatibility of $\mathcal{OC}$ with pairings:

THEOREM 30 ([**GPS2**], see also [**AFO**$^+$]). *Up to a sign of $(-1)^{n(n+1)/2}$, $\mathcal{OC}$ is an* isometry, *meaning that it intertwines pairings:*

$$\langle \mathcal{OC}(\alpha), \mathcal{OC}(\beta) \rangle_X = (-1)^{n(n+1)/2} \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle_{Muk}.$$

This Theorem, which is a version of the Cardy condition arising from a certain comparison of (operations associated to) different degenerations of J-holomorphic maps maps from an annulus, will be implemented in [**GPS2**] in the setting of the relative Fukaya category. The proof in the monotone case is basically identical but strictly easier, so we will not repeat it.

5. Proof of Main Results

LEMMA 31. *If X is Calabi-Yau, and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}(X)$ is a non-empty full subcategory, then* $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1$. *In particular, since* $\mathrm{QH}^0(X) = \mathbb{K}$, *it follows that* $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}) \geq \mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{QH}^0(X)$.

PROOF. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is cohomologically unital, $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{A})$ is a unital algebra, and there is a unital map $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{A}) \to H^*(\hom_{\mathcal{F}}(L, L))$ for any object L of $\mathcal{A}$. When $\mathcal{A}$ is non-empty, there is an object $L \in \mathrm{ob}\ \mathcal{A}$ with $H^*(\hom_{\mathcal{A}}(L, L)) \neq 0$, hence $[id_L] \in H^*(\hom_{\mathcal{A}}(L, L))$ is not zero, and the unit in $\mathrm{HH}^*(\mathcal{A})$ cannot vanish. □

Below we prove Theorems 1 and 2 simultaneously, suppressing the summand decompositions that occur in the latter case. So when X is monotone, all instances of $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ should be replaced with $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w$.

PROOF OF THEOREMS 1 AND 2. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1 or 2. It follows that $\mathcal{A}$ is a smooth and proper category, and in particular, $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{A})$ is finite dimensional and the Mukai pairing

$$\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{A}) \otimes \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathbb{K}$$

is *non-degenerate* by Proposition 21, meaning the induced adjoint map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^L_{Muk} : \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{A}) &\to \mathrm{HH}_{-*}(\mathcal{A})^\vee \\ \phi^L_{Muk}(\alpha) &:= \langle \alpha, - \rangle_{Muk} \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

is an isomorphism. But, by Theorem 30, the isomorphism ϕ^L_{Muk} fits into the following commutative (up to an overall sign of $(-1)^{n(n+1)}$) diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathrm{HH}_{n-*}(\mathcal{A})^\vee \\ & {\scriptstyle \mathcal{OC}} \searrow \quad \overset{\phi^L_{Muk}}{} \quad \nearrow {\scriptstyle \mathcal{OC}_1^\vee} & \\ & \mathrm{QH}^*(X) & \end{array} \tag{5.2}$$

where $\mathcal{OC}_1^\vee$ is as in (4.5). Note that we are using the shorthand $\mathcal{OC}$ above for $\mathcal{OC}|_{\mathcal{A}}$, and similarly for $\mathcal{OC}_1^\vee$.

It follows immediately from the isomorphism (5.1) and the diagram (5.2) that the map $\mathcal{OC} : \mathrm{HH}_{-n}(\mathcal{A}) \to \mathrm{QH}^0(X)$ is injective and $\mathcal{OC}_1^\vee : \mathrm{QH}^0(X) \to \mathrm{HH}_n(\mathcal{A})^\vee$ is surjective. Moreover, as all of the vector spaces in (5.2) are finite dimensional, $\mathcal{OC}_1^\vee$ and $\mathcal{OC}$ will be isomorphisms if and only if $\mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{QH}^0(X) \leq \mathrm{rk}\ \mathrm{HH}_n(\mathcal{A})^\vee$. Since $\mathcal{A}$, like any full subcategory of the Fukaya category, is *weak proper Calabi-Yau* (see §3.5 and §4.1), Lemma 20 implies that $\mathrm{HH}_n(\mathcal{A})^\vee \cong \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A})$, so $\mathcal{OC}$ is an

isomorphism onto $QH^0(X)$ if and only if rk $\mathrm{QH}^0(X) \leq$ rk $\mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A})$. This last condition is ensured by hypothesis in the monotone case or automatically in the Calabi-Yau case by Lemma 31. So $\mathcal{OC}$ is an isomorphism from $\mathrm{HH}_{-n}(\mathcal{A})$ onto $\mathrm{QH}^0(X)$ and in particular hits the unit. By definition, we have shown that $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies Abouzaid's split-generation criterion (Theorem 28 or 29), so it split-generates $\mathcal{F}$. □

Remark 32. The fact that smoothness of $\mathcal{A}$ implies that $\mathcal{OC}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is injective was already observed in [**GPS1**].

For completeness, we also recall the version of the proof of Corollary 7 appearing in [**GPS1**] (which requires just the structures we have already developed):

Proof of Corollary 7. Under the hypotheses given, $\mathcal{A}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}$ so $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{F})$ by Morita invariance of Hochschild homology. The proof of Theorems 1 and 2, which invoke the compatibility of $\mathcal{OC}$ with the Mukai pairing (Theorem 30), imply that the map $\mathcal{OC} : \mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ is injective and hits the unit. By the compatibility of $\mathcal{OC}$ with module structures (see Proposition 27), it follows that $\mathcal{OC}$ is surjective too. Hence, $\mathcal{OC}$ is an isomorphism. Since $\mathcal{CO}$ is linear dual to $\mathcal{OC}$ by Corollary 26, $\mathcal{CO}$ is an isomorphism too. □

Remark 33. Let X be a general symplectic manifold. The methods of [**FOOO1**, **FOOO2**, **AFO**$^+$] determine from X a *curved* A_∞ *category* over Λ, which contains genuine A_∞ subcategories of weakly unobstructed objects (or objects with weak bounding co-chains) $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda^{>0}$. Unlike the monotone case, the values of λ for which $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$ is non-trivial are not necessarily eigenvalues of $c_1(X) \star -$ (rather, the precise relationship is unknown, c.f., [**Se6**, Remark 5.4]). The analogous results to Theorems 1 and 2 say that for any homologically smooth $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}_\lambda$, $\mathrm{HH}_{*-n}(\mathcal{A})$ injects onto an idempotent summand $q(\mathrm{QH}^*(X))$, $q \in \mathrm{QH}^*(X)$, and moreover generates $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda,q}$, the projection of the Fukaya category onto this summand.

More generally, if one has found a collection of smooth full subcategories $\mathcal{A}_i \subset \mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}$ with λ_i distinct, and $\sum_i$ rk $\mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq$ rk $\mathrm{QH}^0(X)$, then the $\mathcal{A}_i$ split-generate the Fukaya category.

The last assertion follows from the usual proof given above, along with the fact, which will appear in [**AFO**$^+$], explained to the author by K. Fukaya, that the images of $\mathrm{HH}_*(\mathcal{A}_i)$ in $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)$ must be orthogonal.

6. Applications

We anticipate many applications of this result to computing (derived) Fukaya categories and proving homological mirror symmetry. In the latter case, the key point is to exploit algebro-geometric criteria for verifying homological smoothness discussed in §3.3; for instance, if $\mathcal{C}$ is Morita equivalent to $Coh(Y)$ for some Y then $\mathcal{C}$ is smooth [**Lu**].

6.1. Calabi-Yau homological mirror symmetry. As already noted in [**PS2**], Corollary 35 below implies simplified proofs of full Homological Mirror Symmetry (HMS) for Calabi-Yau manifolds, for instance for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in projective space [**Se8**, **Sh2**]; namely one does not need to prove by hand that the Lagrangians considered in these examples split-generate the Fukaya category. To formulate this simplification precisely, we recall the notion of 'Core HMS':

Definition 34 (Compare Perutz-Sheridan [**PS2**]). *Let $(X,\mathbf{D})$ be a pair with $c_1(X) = 0$, $[\mathbf{D}] = \omega$ as in §2.3 and Y a smooth scheme over Spec$(\mathbb{C}((q)))$ with $c_1(Y) = 0$. We say the pair $((X,\mathbf{D}),Y)$ satisfy* Core HMS *if there is*

- *a full sub-category $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}(X,\mathbf{D})$;*
- *a full split-generating sub-category $\mathcal{B} \subset D^b_{dg}Coh(Y)$, where $D^b_{dg}Coh(Y)$ is the (dg enhanced) derived category of coherent sheaves; and*
- *a quasi-equivalence $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$.*

An immediate corollary of our main Theorem 1 is:

COROLLARY 35 (Compare [**PS2**]). *Suppose* $(X, \mathbf{D})$ *and* Y *as above satisfy Core HMS. Then the subcategory* $\mathcal{A}$ *split-generates* $\mathcal{F}(X, \mathbf{D})$*, and hence there is an equivalence of split-closed derived categories*

$$perf(\mathcal{F}(X, \mathbf{D})) \cong D^b_{dg} Coh(Y).$$

PROOF OF COROLLARY 35. The category $D^b_{dg}(Coh(Y))$ is homologically smooth by a theorem of Lunts [**Lu**], and smoothness is a Morita invariant notion (see Proposition 19). Since $\mathcal{A}$ is quasi-isomorphic to a category which split-generates $D^b_{dg}(Coh(Y))$, or in other words Morita equivalent to $D^b_{dg}(Coh(Y))$, it follows that $\mathcal{A}$ is non-empty and homologically smooth. Hence, it satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1. □

REMARK 36. The main Theorem of [**PS2**] further requires the mirror Y to have 'maximally unipotent monodromy.' Corollary 35 places no such restrictions on Y, so seems to apply in a more general setting (or at least one no longer needs to check such a property). However, a posteriori, as observed in [**PS2**], maximally unipotent monodromy of Y is a consequence of any homological mirror equivalence in the Calabi-Yau setting over Novikov fields: because the top quantum product $[\omega]^{\star n} = 1 + O(q) \neq 0$, an HMS equivalence guarantees that the mirror to $[\omega]$ in the cohomology of polyvectorfields on Y must have non-vanishing top power. The results of [**PS2**] imply that under homological mirror hypotheses involving the relative Fukaya category, the symplectic form $[\omega]$ is automatically mirror to the Kodaira-Spencer class $KS(q\partial q)$; hence $KS(q\partial q)^{\wedge n} \neq 0$, which is a form of maximal unipotence of Y.

We remark that there are situations in which the Fukaya category, quantum cohomology, and open-closed maps are known or expected to be *convergent*, in the sense that one can just set $q = \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and all of the structures continue to be well-defined [**Se7**]. In these cases, it is no longer true that the mirror (for fixed value of q) will be a family with any sort of monodromy hypothesis. Our methods would continue to apply provided all open-closed structures discuss are also convergent.

REMARK 37. There was no real need for us to to use the relative Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}(X, \mathbf{D})$ above aside from concretely specifying a technical setup; one can make the same definition for a full subcategory of the general Fukaya category $\mathcal{F}(X)$ of [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$], in which case the mirror is defined over $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}$. Provided all of the general structures of Fukaya categories discussed here are verified, the same result continues to hold.

6.2. Fano Mirror Symmetry. Our new Corollary 40 below implies a similar simplified proof of full HMS for Fano varieties. Previously studied examples to which Theorem 2 apply and simplify existing HMS proofs (by removing the need to check generation of the Fukaya category by hand) include:

- Fano hypersurfaces in projective space, which were considered in [**Sm**, **Sh3**].
- Fano toric varieties, considered in [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$] (see also [**C1**, **C2**, **CO**, **FOOO3**]). In fact, we expect the version of our Theorem for general Fukaya categories (see Remark 33) to similarly simplify the proof of split-generation required for proving full HMS in [$\mathbf{AFO}^+$].

REMARK 38. When X is a Fano toric manifold, the generation of its Fukaya category by the monotone toric fiber (equipped with various local systems) is also a corollary of Evans-Lekili's work on generation by Hamiltonian orbits [**EL**].

Recall that the mirror partner to a Fano (or general non-Calabi-Yau) variety is a *Landau-Ginzburg (LG) model*, which is a pair (Y, W) of a non-compact Calabi-Yau variety Y over $\mathbb{C}$ equipped with a holomorphic function $W : Y \to \mathbb{C}$. To such an LG model one can associate the dg category of *matrix factorizations*

$$\mathrm{MF}(Y, W) \tag{6.1}$$

as defined in [**E**, **Or2**, **LP**] The category of matrix factorizations (6.1) reflects the singularities of the fiber of W over $0 \in \mathbb{C}$ (specifically, there is an equivalence of triangulated categories $H^*(\mathrm{MF}(Y, W)) \cong$

$D^b_{sing}(W^{-1}(0))$, where $D^b_{sing}(Z)$ is the *derived category of singularities of* Z, which vanishes if Z is smooth [**Or1**]). We use the notation

$$\mathrm{MF}_y(Y,W) := \mathrm{MF}(Y, W-y) \tag{6.2}$$

for the category associated to the fiber over $y \in \mathbb{C}$. There is a corresponding closed sector group (again associated to each $y \in \mathbb{C}$)

$$\mathbb{R}\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet T_Y, [W-y, \cdot]) \tag{6.3}$$

(note that when W has isolated singularities, $H^0(\mathbb{R}\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet T_Y, [W-y,\cdot]))$ is simply the *Jacobian ring* of $W-y$). One version of HMS for a pair $(X,(Y,W))$ where X is Fano posits that there is a Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{F}(X) = \oplus_w \mathcal{F}_w(X)$ and $\oplus_y \mathrm{MF}_y(Y,W)$ (note that in either case, only finitely many summands are non-empty); HMS can also be studied a single summand at a time.

Our Theorem 2 simplifies the matter of proving HMS for a pair $(X,(Y,W))$ in roughly the following way: if one has found a collection of some Lagrangians $\{L_i\}$ in the monotone symplectic manifold X, and compared the A_∞ subcategory of those Lagrangians with a split-generating subcategory of $\mathrm{MF}(Y,W)$ mirror Landau-Ginzburg model (Y,W), then upon verifying one more hypothesis, these Lagrangians will split-generate the Fukaya category, implying full HMS. The additional hypothesis, related to the rank inequality in Theorem 2, is a rank comparison between the zeroth quantum cohomology and the zero-dimensional piece of the closed string group (6.3). Formulating the hypotheses more precisely:

Definition 39. *Let $X := (X,\omega)$ be a monotone symplectic manifold, and (Y,W) an LG model. We say the pair $(X,(Y,W))$ satisfies* Core HMS for summand pair $(w,y) \in \mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}$ *if there is*

- *a full sub-category $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}_w(X)$,*
- *a full split-generating sub-category $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathrm{MF}_y(Y,W)$,*
- *a quasi-equivalence $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$, and*
- *a vector space isomorphism $\mathrm{QH}^0(X)_w \cong H^0(\mathbb{R}\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet T_Y, [W-y,\cdot]))$.*

The last condition is really a statement about a classical 'closed string' mirror equivalence (but just on the level of verifying a rank equality of vector spaces, not an algebra isomorphism). We note that both sides are two-periodically graded, as the differential $[W-y,-]$ only preserves the parity of the grading of a polyvector field.

Corollary 40. *Suppose $(X,(Y,W))$ satisfies* Core HMS for summand pair (w,y). *Then, X and (Y,W) are homologically mirror for summand pair (w,y). In particular, $\mathcal{A}$ split-generates $\mathcal{F}_w(X)$, so there is a quasi-equivalence*

$$perf(\mathcal{F}_w(X)) \cong \mathrm{MF}_y(Y,W)$$

(and hence also a ring isomorphism $\mathrm{QH}^*(X)_w \cong H^*(\mathbb{R}\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet T_Y, [W-y,\cdot]))$).

Proof of Corollary 40. The category $MF_y(Y,W)$ is homologically smooth by the results in [**D**, **P**, **LP**], and smoothness is a Morita invariant notion (see Proposition 19). Since $\mathcal{A}$ is quasi-isomorphic to a category which split-generates $MF_y(Y,W)$, it follows that $\mathcal{A}$ is non-empty and smooth. Since it is known [**D**, **P**, **LP**] that

$$\mathrm{HH}^*(MF_y(Y,W)) \cong H^*(\mathbb{R}\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet T_Y, [W-y,\cdot])),$$

it follows by Morita invariance of Hochschild cohomology and the last Core HMS hypothesis that there are vector space isomorphisms $\mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathrm{HH}^0(\mathcal{B}) \cong \mathrm{HH}^0(MF_y(Y,W)) \cong H^0(\mathbb{R}\Gamma(\wedge^\bullet T_Y, [W-y,\cdot])) \cong \mathrm{QH}^0(X)_w$. The hypotheses of Theorem 2 are therefore satisfied. □

References

[Abb] Hossein Abbaspour, *On algebraic structures of the Hochschild complex*, Free loop spaces in geometry and topology, 2015, pp. 165–222.

[Abo] Mohammed Abouzaid, *A geometric criterion for generating the Fukaya category*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **112** (2010), 191–240.

[AFO+] Mohammed Abouzaid, Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Quantum cohomology and split generation in Lagrangian Floer theory*. in preparation.

[Au] Denis Auroux, *Mirror symmetry and T-duality in the complement of an anticanonical divisor*, J. Gökova Geom. Topol. GGT **1** (2007), 51–91.

[B] Aleksandr Beĭlinson, *Coherent sheaves on* $\mathbf{P}^n$ *and problems in linear algebra*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **12** (1978), no. 3, 68–69.

[BC] Paul Biran and Octav Cornea, *Lagrangian cobordism and Fukaya categories*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **24** (2014), no. 6, 1731–1830.

[C1] Cheol-Hyun Cho, *Holomorphic discs, spin structures, and Floer cohomology of the Clifford torus*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **35** (2004), 1803–1843.

[C2] ———, *Products of Floer cohomology of torus fibers in toric Fano manifolds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **260** (2005), no. 3, 613–640.

[CO] Cheol-Hyun Cho and Yong-Geun Oh, *Floer cohomology and disc instantons of Lagrangian torus fibers in Fano toric manifolds*, Asian J. Math. **10** (2006), no. 4, 773–814.

[D] Tobias Dyckerhoff, *Compact generators in categories of matrix factorizations*, Duke Math. J. **159** (2011), no. 2, 223–274.

[E] David Eisenbud, *Homological algebra on a complete intersection, with an application to group representations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **260** (1980), no. 1, 35–64.

[EL] Jonathan Evans and Yankı Lekili, *Generating the Fukaya categories of Hamiltonian G-manifolds*, 2015. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05842`.

[FHT] Yves Félix, Steve Halperin, and Jean-Claude Thomas, *Differential graded algebras in topology*, Handbook of algebraic topology, 1995, pp. 829–865.

[F] Kenji Fukaya, *Cyclic symmetry and adic convergence in Lagrangian Floer theory*, Kyoto J. Math. **50** (2010), no. 3, 521–590.

[FOOO1] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. Part I*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 46, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.

[FOOO2] ———, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. Part II*, AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 46, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.

[FOOO3] ———, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds. I*, Duke Math. J. **151** (2010), no. 1, 23–174.

[G1] Sheel Ganatra, *Symplectic cohomology and duality for the wrapped Fukaya category*, 2012. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT. Available at `arXiv.org/abs/1304.7312`.

[G2] ———, *Cyclic homology,* S^1*-equivariant Floer cohomology, and Calabi-Yau structures*, 2015. In preparation.

[GPS1] Sheel Ganatra, Tim Perutz, and Nick Sheridan, *Mirror symmetry: from categories to curve counts*, 2015. available at `arXiv.org/abs/1510.03839`.

[GPS2] ———, *The cyclic open-closed map and noncommutative Hodge structures*. In preparation.

[K] Maxim Kontsevich, *A letter to A. Beilinson*, 1999. available at `http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~mitya/langlands/kontsevichletter.txt`.

[KS] Maxim Kontsevich and Yan Soibelman, *Notes on A-infinity algebras, A-infinity categories and non-commutative geometry. I* (2006). available at `arXiv.org/abs/math/0606241`.

[Lu] Valery Lunts, *Categorical resolution of singularities*, J. Algebra **323** (2010), no. 10, 2977–3003.

[Ly] Volodymyr Lyubashenko, A_∞*-morphisms with several entries*, 2012. available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.6072`.

[LP] Kevin Lin and Daniel Pomerleano, *Global matrix factorizations*, Math. Res. Lett. **20** (2013), no. 1, 91–106.

[MS] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 52, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.

[O1] Yong-Geun Oh, *Floer cohomology of Lagrangian intersections and pseudo-holomorphic disks. I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), no. 7, 949–993.

[O2] ———, *Floer cohomology of Lagrangian intersections and pseudo-holomorphic disks. II.* $(\mathbf{C}\mathrm{P}^n, \mathbf{R}\mathrm{P}^n)$, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), no. 7, 995–1012.

[O3] ———, *Addendum to 'Floer cohomology of Lagrangian intersections and pseudo-holomorphic disks, I'*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **48** (1995), 1299–1302.

[Or1] Dmitri Orlov, *Triangulated categories of singularities and d-branes in landau-ginzburg models*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 2004, no. 3 (246), 227–248 (2004), available at `math/0302304`.

[Or2] ———, *Matrix factorizations for nonaffine LG-models*, Math. Ann. **353** (2012), no. 1, 95–108.

[P] Anatoly Preygel, *Thom-sebastiani and duality for matrix factorizations*, 2011. available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5834`.

[PS1] Tim Perutz and Nick Sheridan, *Foundations of the relative Fukaya category*. in preparation.

[PS2] ———, *Automatic split-generation for the Fukaya category*, 2015. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03848`.

[RS] Alexander Ritter and Ivan Smith, *The monotone wrapped Fukaya category and the open-closed string map*, 2012. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.5880`.

[RT] Yongbin Ruan and Gang Tian, *A mathematical theory of quantum cohomology*, J. Differential Geom. **42** (1995), no. 2, 259–367.

[Se1] Paul Seidel, *Fukaya categories and deformations*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), 2002, pp. 351–360.

[Se2] ———, *A_∞-subalgebras and natural transformations*, Homology, Homotopy Appl. **10** (2008), no. 2, 83–114.

[Se3] ———, *Fukaya categories and Picard-Lefschetz theory*, Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.

[Se4] ———, *Suspending Lefschetz fibrations, with an application to local mirror symmetry*, Comm. Math. Phys. **297** (2010), no. 2, 515–528.

[Se5] ———, *Lectures on Categorical Dynamics and Symplectic Topology*, 2013. Available at `http://math.mit.edu/~seidel/937/lecture-notes.pdf`.

[Se6] ———, *Abstract analogues of flux as symplectic invariants*, Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.) **137** (2014), 135.

[Se7] ———, *Fukaya A_∞-structures associated to Lefschetz fibrations. II 1/2*, 2015. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.06317`.

[Se8] ———, *Homological mirror symmetry for the quartic surface*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **236** (2015), no. 1116, vi+129.

[Sh1] Nick Sheridan, *Formulae in noncommutative Hodge theory*, 2015. available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03795`.

[Sh2] ———, *Homological mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in projective space*, Invent. Math. **199** (2015), no. 1, 1–186.

[Sh3] ———, *On the Fukaya category of a Fano hypersurface in projective space*, Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS (2016), 1–153.

[Shk] Dmytro Shklyarov, *Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch-type formula for DG algebras*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **106** (2013), no. 1, 1–32.

[Sm] Ivan Smith, *Floer cohomology and pencils of quadrics*, Invent. Math. **189** (2012), no. 1, 149–250.

[T] Thomas Tradler, *Infinity-inner-products on A-infinity-algebras*, J. Homotopy Relat. Struct. **3** (2008), no. 1, 245–271.